



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/657,460	09/07/2000	Toshimitsu Suzuki	21.1983	1685

21171 7590 05/22/2003

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
700 11TH STREET, NW
SUITE 500
WASHINGTON, DC 20001

EXAMINER

VU, THANH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 05/22/2003

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

2

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/657,460

Applicant(s)

SUZUKI ET AL.

Examiner

Thanh T. Vu

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-4, 8-15, 17-23, 27-33, 35-39, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kanevsky (U.S. Pat. No. 6,300,947).

Per claim 1, Kanevsky teaches a method of distributing information from at least one information distribution server to a plurality of terminals via a network, comprising: converting, in response to a request from a requesting terminal, requested information into display information in a format that can be utilized by the requesting terminal based on environment information for the requesting terminal (col. 2, lines 2-19, col. 3, lines 53-67; col. 7, lines 25-29).

Per claim 2, Kanevsky teaches a method as recited in claim 1, wherein the environment information is obtained from an information request from the requesting terminal for the requested information (fig 1; col. 6, lines 20-28).

Per claim 3, Kanevsky teaches a method as recited in claim 2, wherein the environment information includes identification of an application executing on the requesting terminal that issued the information request (col. 6, lines 20-27).

Per claim 4, Kanevsky teaches a method as recited in claim 3, further comprising determining whether to perform said converting by using the identification of the application to

Art Unit: 2174

access an application function management table cross referencing a plurality of registered applications and functions provided by the registered applications (fig. 1; col. 6, lines 53-64; col. 8, lines 24-34 and lines 44-49).

Per claim 8, Kanevsky teaches a method as recited in claim 4, further comprising determining how to perform said converting by using the identification of the application to access a processing function management table cross referencing the plurality of registered applications with ways to convert information (col. 6, lines 53-64; col. 8, lines 24-34).

Per claim 9, Kanevsky teaches a method as recited in claim 8, wherein the environment information is supplemented using a user identifier, corresponding to a user of the requesting terminal, to access a user management table cross referencing a plurality of user identifiers with at least one of applications available at user terminals and types of user terminals (col. 6, lines 53-64; col. 8, lines 24-34 and lines 53-57).

Per claim 10, Kanevsky teaches a method as recited in claim 1, wherein said converting includes converting a pointer that cannot be resolved by the requesting terminal, by replacing the pointer with the content pointed to (fig. 3; col. 8, lines 44-62; col. 9, lines 3-6).

Per claim 11, Kanevsky teaches a method as recited in claim 1, wherein said converting includes converting a pointer that cannot be resolved by the requesting terminal into a file name to be displayed (col. 9, lines 7-17).

Per claim 12, Kanevsky teaches a method as recited in claim 1, wherein said converting includes converting a link of a type that the application does not support into at least one link of a type supported by the application (col. 9, lines 35-43; col. 10, lines 5-15).

Art Unit: 2174

Per claim 13, Kanevsky teaches a method as recited in claim 12, wherein said converting converts at least one of extended links and both-way links into one-way links (figs. 11 and 13; col. 14, lines 15-20; col. 15, lines 5-11).

Per claim 14, Kanevsky teaches a system for distributing information to a plurality of terminals via a network, comprising: a network interface unit, coupled to the network, to receive an information request from a requesting terminal and to transmit display information to the requesting terminal (fig. 1; client machine 100 and server 104; request message 102); and a converting function unit, coupled to said network interface unit, to convert requested information into the display information that can be utilized by the requesting terminal based on environment information for the requesting terminal (col. 2, lines 2-19, col. 3, lines 53-67; col. 7, lines 25-29).

Claim 15 is rejected under the same rationales as claims 3 and 4.

Claim 17 is rejected under the same rationales as claims 3 and 4.

Claim 18 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 4.

Claim 19 is rejected under the same rationales as claims 11 and 13.

Claims 20-23, 27-30, and 31 are rejected under the same rationale as claim 1-4, 8-11, and 13 respectively.

Per claim 32, Kanevsky teaches an information distribution method used by an information distribution service to receive a request for information distribution from a terminal connected via a network and to transmit requested information to the terminal, comprising: verifying functions of an application used by the terminal that sent the request for information distribution upon receipt thereof, determining whether the functions of the application can process requested information (col. 8, lines 24-34 and lines 44-64); and converting, when it is

Art Unit: 2174

determined that the process is impossible, the requested information into a format which may be processed by the application prior to transmission to the terminal (col. 2, lines 2-19, col. 3, lines 53-67, col. 7, lines 25-29).

Per claim 33, Kanevsky teaches An information distribution apparatus of an information distribution service to receive requests for information distribution from terminals connected thereto via a network and to transmit requested information to the terminals, comprising:

a conversion determination table provided for management of applications which may be operated on the terminal and corresponding functions to be processed by the applications (fig. 1, col. 6, lines 53-64);

an application identification unit to identify the application used by a requesting terminal when an information request is accepted from the requesting terminal (fig. 1; col. 7, lines 25-28 and lines 50-56);

a conversion determination unit, coupled to said conversion determination table and said application identification unit, to determine whether the application can process the requested information by referring to said conversion determination table (figs. 1 and 3, col. 8, lines 24-34 and lines 44-64);

a converting unit, coupled to said conversion determination unit, to convert the requested information into converted information that can be processed by the requesting terminal when it is determined that the application cannot process the requested information (figs. 1 and 3, col. 8, lines 24-34 and lines 44-64; col. 9, lines 35-40); and

a transmission unit, coupled to said converting unit, to transmit the converted information to the requesting terminal (fig 1; col. 7, lines 42-56).

Per claim 35, Kanevsky teaches an information distribution apparatus as recited in claim 33, wherein said converting unit converts, when the requested information includes content which cannot be processed by the requesting terminal, only that portion of the content which cannot be processed, depending on a converting system registered in said conversion determination table (col. 7, lines 25-40; col. 9, lines 35-40).

Per claim 36, Kanevsky teaches an information distribution apparatus as recited in claim 35, wherein a remaining portion of the content not processed by said converting unit is a link function or pointer function of XML (col. 7, lines 25-40; col. 9, lines 35-40; col. 10, lines 5-10).

Per claim 37, Kanevsky teaches a terminal apparatus used to receive an information distribution service that responds to an information distribution request from said terminal apparatus connected via a network by transmitting requested information to said terminal apparatus, comprising: a requesting unit, coupled to the network, to include in the information distribution request information about at least one of an application used in said terminal apparatus and a function of the application (fig. 1; client unit 100; requesting message 102; col. 6, lines 20-28).

Per claim 38, Kanevsky teaches a terminal used to receive an information distribution service that responds to an information distribution request from said terminal connected via a network by transmitting requested information to said terminal, comprising: a computing unit, coupled to said network, which uses browser software on connection to the information distribution service to transmit, together with the information distribution request, information about at least one of application software which may be operated in cooperation with the browser

Art Unit: 2174

software and application functions (fig. 1; client unit 100 and web browser 101; col. 6, lines 20-28).

Claim 39 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 33.

Claim 41 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 33.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky (U.S. Pat. No. 6,300,947) in view of Bhide et al. ("Bhide", U.S. Pat. No. 5,852,717).

Per claim 5, Kanevsky teaches the method as recited in claim 4, but does not teach the identification identifies a browser application by name and version, that issued the information request. However, Bhide teaches the method of identification identifies a browser application by name and version that issued the information request (col. 12, lines 4-14). According, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the method as taught by Bhide in the invention of Kanevsky because it provides a method for increasing the performance of the computer networks utilizing the HTTP request.

Claim 24 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 5.

Claims 6-7, 16, 25-26, 34, 40, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky (U.S. Pat. No. 6,300,947) in view of Agraharam et al. ("Agraharam" U.S. Pat. No. 6,035,339).

Per claim 6, Kanevsky teaches the method as recited in claim 4, but does not teach said determining is further performed by transmitting an inquiry to the requesting terminal when the application function management table is unable to determine whether a required function included in the requested information can be performed at the requesting terminal. However, Agraharam teaches a method comprising said determining is further performed by transmitting an inquiry to the requesting terminal when the application function management table is unable to determine whether a required function included in the requested information can be performed at the requesting terminal (col. 1, lines 47-55; col. 7, lines 1-12). According, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the method as taught by Agraharam in the invention of Kanevsky because it provides a method to more conveniently determine the user terminal capabilities by transmitting an inquiry to the end-user terminal and to deliver information that the user terminal capabilities may be most effectively used.

Per claim 7, Kanevsky teaches a method as recited in claim 6, wherein said transmitting includes transmitting the inquiry with the required function incorporated therein, such that the inquiry can be responded to only if the required function executes properly on the requesting terminal, and wherein said determining is further based on whether a response to the inquiry is received from the requesting terminal (col. 7, lines 1-12).

Claim 16 is rejected under the same rationales as claims 6 and 7.

Claim 25 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 6.

Claim 26 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 7.

Claims 34, 40, and 42 individually are rejected under the same rationale as claim 6.

Art Unit: 2174

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Grandcolas et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,332,131) discloses method and system for automatically harmonizing access to a software application program via different access devices.

Hill et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,023,714) discloses method and system for dynamically adapting the layout of a document to an output device.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh T. Vu whose telephone number is (703)-308-9119. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur and every other Fri 8:30 AM - 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)-746-7239 for regular communications and (703)-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

T. Vu
May 14, 2003

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100